

Meeting Title:	MTAC PTR eVS Work Group 178		
Meeting Objective(s):	Monthly meeting with Industry		
Date:	6/8/2016	Time:	4:00-5:30 PM ET
Location:	WebEx/Juliaann's Conference Room		
Attendees:	Dennis, Alvin Serrano, Charles Tricamo, Chris Liebe, Crystal Stefanko, Christiana Halim, Dale Kennedy, Doug Ferguson, Bill Vanderveer, Gary Rogan, Henry Chau, Jaclyn Tubbin, John Papp, Maura Lowell, Oscar Vazquez, Randy Randall, Richard Porras, Roger Franco, Wanda Santos, Wendy Smith, Willie Jackson, Paul Kovlakas, Bob Schimek, Vicki Dansereau, Isaac Cronkhite, Jim Wilson, Monica Lundquist, Sharon Harrison, John Medeiros, Kevin Elkin, Lina Kelly, Marsha, Maura Lowell, Paige Eckard		

Agenda Item	Topic	Minutes		
1.	Action Item Review	Action Item	Description	Update
		1.	Include the write-up of customer lessons learned, best practices and tactics that have improved performance with 6/1 minutes	Due 6/15
		2.	Look into combining IMpb assessments and quality assessments for validations	Will be discussed today
		3.	Send Bill Vanderveer examples of exceptions of customizable entry locations	Complete, John sent a file with 2 different types of assessments - customized entry via NSA, and several hundred that showed assessment for a duplicate assessment in IMpb and in destination entry validation.
		4.	Review and make sure customers are not being double charged with customizable entry locations. Also to look at the volume that this situation occurs to see if threshold covers it	eVS and PTR need to review the data together and then will provide feedback to John. ACTION: Schedule a follow up with eVS, PTR and John to walk through the data and draw conclusions – due 6/15
		5.	Emphasize that customers can submit corrections during webinars and other documentations to Industry	ACTION: W. Santos to update the Pub 199 to include the fact that customers can submit corrections.

Agenda Item	Topic	Minutes		
		6.	Include Oscar's feedback about PRC	Included in last week's minutes and will be added to Industry Feedback slides
		7.	Check with legal if USPS is leveraging a charge on failure to provide certain data in adequate and legal maneuver doesn't require PRC approval?	Open
		8.	Provide customers total performance with current criteria and with new proposed criteria with the simplified list	Will discuss today
		9.	Identify reasons why Mailers would get a ZIP+4 with a missing street number or with an invalid primary street number. Why are they not a subset of the Missing Secondary Information in the DPV footnotes?	USPS is following up with the address management team
		10.	Look at creating a report that is sent to customers weekly for IMpb compliance like the manifested file report	Will discuss today
		11.	Split up the time with agenda items to keep WG on track	Complete
2.	Current IMpb Compliance Thresholds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Related to Action item #2, USPS analyzed IMpb Compliance for existing metrics and quality metrics, and the impact of simplifying to Quality metrics only. • The current compliance measures Shipping Services File (SSF), Barcode format, and version DZ (destination delivery address and 11 digit destination ZIP). • The IMpb quality compliance metrics measure the manifest quality (MQ), address quality (AQ), and barcode quality (BQ). • USPS analyzed the results of moving forward with combining volume from the original IMpb compliance elements with volume for the new IMpb Quality compliance elements. The original items would be new validations under MQ, AQ, and BQ. • The MQ indicator will include the SF and UN mail pieces, the BQ indicator will include BF mail pieces, and AQ indicator will include DZ mail pieces. This will make up a total of 13 items assessed for quality, rather than the proposed 10. • Kevin Elkin asked if customers would still be able to drill down into the details of the errors to know what needs correcting. Juliaann Hess confirmed that customers would still know, for example, that an AQ issue would be because of a missing street address. USPS would still provide the reason of the warning. <p>April 2016 Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • USPS took the April data and eliminated the current requirements by adding the volume of each to the respective categories for IMpb quality. • Note – the data shown reflects all the volume for each quality bucket, the 69 quality validations (rather than 13). • ACTION: USPS to look at performance results if included the original 3 compliance validations with 10 proposed IMpb quality validations for larger shippers. • ACTION: USPS to re-evaluate the May data for the 10 proposed IMpb quality validations. 		

Agenda Item	Topic	Minutes
		<p>Industry feedback</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Medeiros thinks this adds a layer of simplification, but it is hard to make quantitative decisions because Industry does not have remaining data. • USPS will provide the May data to Industry for the 10 IMpb quality validations, then Industry can use their original IMpb compliance thresholds and metrics to understand what the two combined would look like. Customers can add the IMpb noncompliance volume to the quality noncompliance volume then compare it to the threshold for quality. • John Medeiros brought up for AQ that today Industry is only being measured to determine if they provide an address in the file, not relative to accuracy. He questioned that if there is no address then wouldn't that also affect the quality? Juliaann Hess replied that USPS will not double charge. The AQ measures quality and the DZ today measured whether the address is there. • The missing address (DZ) would be counted under the new reporting under AQ as a separate element of AQ. • Randy Randall likes the idea of having a concise view of all the IMpb compliance. He asked if we take DZ and add to address quality and already border line in AQ, wouldn't that push us into jeopardy by combining them? Juliaann Hess responded that the performance goes down when the existing original IMpb compliance validations volume, so it may put those on the line at risk. • Takeaways – The Work Group is interested in pursuing a simplified list of thresholds. • John agrees and Paul thinks it is worth exploring the simplified list. • Kevin likes the area of simplification but thinks it still needs specific layers to drill down to specifics. • Sharon likes that the simplified list is rolled up to provide a higher level of what issues need further exploring. She asked if USPS reports on delivery statistics as far as the number of pieces delivered. She wants something to identify delivery data so mailers have a sense of products to see if packages are getting to customers timely. Juliaann responded that USPS reports on these internally and externally. Individual customers can work through their strategic account managers to make this available through reporting dashboards. • ACTION: USPS to look into what requirements are needed to include the original IMpb compliance metrics with the new quality compliance metrics and include in Work Group recommendations. • John mentioned that if the 3 tier approach moved forward, it will not be public knowledge. It should be in a federal register because this is a dynamic change of what is known to what could be.
3.	Extract file for IMpb Compliance issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industry likes the idea of receiving an extract file that only includes IMpb compliance issues. • Kevin noted that they need this type of report. The letters and flats provide a summary of the number of errors then links to drill down to the problematic jobs. • This file would include records that are updated to compliant for some scenarios when customers get updates. The purpose is different from that of the Scanning Extract File which goes through a different process. • The records would be those that had a noncompliance code (currently the Microstrategy reports pulled in BMEUs). • The report would also include noncompliance codes that fall under the threshold tolerance.

Agenda Item	Topic	Minutes
4.	Review Industry Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 major industry organizations sent a letter to USPS stating that much has been accomplished in Work Group # 178 but Industry needs more time and examples to understand the data that is failing and falling under the thresholds. The AQ and DPV validations are the main concern, more specifically providing the secondary information (which is not a requirement for letters and flats). • The request is to postpone the compliance implementation of the IMpb quality compliance thresholds from July 2016 to January 2017. • USPS is looking to reduce the number of elements where customers will not be at risk. There is concern about outreach to smaller customers. • Steve Belmonte brought to the group's attention his suggestion to proceed with what is planned on the schedule but then do not make Industry pay anything. He agrees that the data needs to be accurate first and then it can be invoiced. • USPS does not plan to send paper invoices, but they can still show what the bill would be if charging. The invoices are calculated based on date and charged to customers' CAPS accounts. This is the same process that eVS uses today. • John Medeiros mentioned that this is new to the perception about there being actual invoices that will serve as a warning to customers. It sounds like the faux invoices are not going to happen, and mailers will not see them unless provided by the service providers or on eVS directly. • USPS is concern with turning on the pilot mode because the current metrics would not be able to be assessed at the same time. • In August, USPS is implementing a fix that affects the particular scenarios where USPS only receive the 11 digit without any address information. Customers that do not fit that profile do not have any impact. • USPS has not moved forward with the requirements to assess the 10 validations because there is not consensus within the Work Group. When this moves forward, it will be a configuration update, not a software change. • Wendy Smith supports the faux invoice to start. She thinks that USPS should try and correlate this effort with IMB. On the letter side, customers can get the data and invoices. • Industry is asking for more time because there are scenarios that are not making sense because there is a lack of detail in categorizing. • Dale clarified that Vicki stated last week that eVS cannot do fake assessments because the system will deduct the fees based on the assessment file. • USPS has a pilot more where customers will not be assessed. If it is turned on, then none of the IMpb quality will be assessed because the thresholds are set to zero. • Wendy thinks this is even more reason to push the data back to January 2017 because IMB had a 2 year work group. • Industry has concerns with all the AQ information, not just the secondary information. • John reiterated USPS is dealing with rookies for AQ. Before IMpb began, Industry only needed to provide a 5 digit ZIP Code.
5.	Walk On	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was discussion of extending the Work Group past 6/15. • Industry believes there are many elements that have not been thoroughly discussed. • USPS continues to ask questions to Industry who cannot provide definitive answers on ghost data. The data Industry is using is not accurate or complete, so it is hard for them to make informed decisions. • USPS requests a target date to reach consensus for the group to drive to. • Wendy Smith suggests extending the WG for 2 more months and then re-evaluate half way through. Randy and John support this.

Agenda Item	Topic	Minutes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The meetings will extend to August 31st and will be moved back to 1 hour (4:00-5:00PM on Wednesdays).• Juliaann Hess proposed to the group to think about moving forward with the MQ and BQ assessments for July. Then the AQ assessments (A1N1) would be deferred to a future date.

Action Items:

Action Item	Description	Action Item Owner	Due Date
1.	Schedule a follow up with eVS, PTR and John to walk through the data and draw conclusions	USPS	6/15
2.	W. Santos to update the Pub 199 to include the fact that customers can submit corrections.	USPS	6/29
3.	Look at performance results if included the original 3 compliance validations with 10 proposed IMpb quality validations for larger shippers	USPS	6/22
4.	Evaluate the May data for the 10 proposed IMpb quality validations	USPS	6/22
5.	Look into what requirements are needed to include the original IMpb compliance metrics with the new quality compliance metrics	USPS	6/22